

**R E M A R K S**

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

**THE CLAIMS**

Claim 17 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of (now canceled) claim 28.

Claims 29, 30 and 32 have been amended to depend from claim 17 instead of from (now canceled) claim 28.

And claims 27, 33 and 37 have been amended to correct some minor clerical errors.

No new matter has been added, and no new issues have been raised which would require further consideration on the merits and/or a new search. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the amendments be approved and entered under 37 CFR 1.116.

**THE PRIOR ART REJECTION**

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by USP 4,308,308 ("Sachse"), and claims 18-39 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in view of various combinations of Sachse with USP 2,198,885 ("Price"), USP 5,595,415 ("Beaulat"), USP 5,744,763 ("Iwasa et al"), and "obvious common knowledge." These rejections, however, are respectfully traversed with respect to the claims as set forth hereinabove.

According to the present invention as recited in amended independent claim 17, an interior member is provided for a cab of a work vehicle. The interior member comprises: a foundation body panel which has a first side and a second side, and which comprises a plurality of ribs at the second side, at least one space being defined by the ribs at the second side of the foundation body panel; an outer layer material provided at the first side of the foundation body panel; a first sound absorbing member comprising a sound absorbing material provided between the outer layer material and the first side of the foundation body panel; and a metal plate provided at the second side of the foundation body panel, wherein the foundation body panel is fastened to the metal plate.

With this structure, a closed space can be provided between the ribbed structure and the metal plate, whereby sound waves which enter into the closed space from the outside are randomly reflected inside the space and are attenuated due to interference, etc. This structure thereby enhances the sound absorbing effects of the interior member.

The Examiner acknowledges that Sachse does not disclose a metal plate as previously recited in claim 28. For this reason, the Examiner has cited Beaulat to supply the missing teachings of Sachse (see item 9 on pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action).

The Examiner cites element 1 of Sachse as an "outer layer material" of claim 17, and the Examiner appears to suggest that the metal skins 1a and 1b of Beaulat would be applied to the structure including element 1 in the drawing of Sachse.

It is respectfully pointed out, however, that element 1 of Sachse is the metal sheet (e.g., a car body metal sheet for a car door) to be stiffened. Therefore, even if Beaulat were considered to be combinable with Sachse, the combination would clearly not result in all three metal sheets (element 1 of Sachse and elements 1a and 1b of Beaulat) being present. Rather, if such a combination (if it were considered reasonable) were considered, it would result in sheets 4 and 3 of Sachse being applied to one of the metal sheets of Beaulat, and the metal sheet 1 of Sachse (which appears to be intended to be a metal sheet for an automotive car door in one example) would be omitted. Presumably, in the combination of Sachse and Beaulat suggested by the Examiner, the sheets 4 and 3 of Sachse would be applied to the inner skin 1b of Beaulat, with element 1b of Beaulat taking the place of element 1 of Sachse.

In this connection, it is noted that Beaulat already discloses a composite lining 3 to be provided on the inner skin 1b, and it is not clear how the composite lining 3 as disclosed by Beaulat would be retained if the sheets 4 and 3 of Sachse were applied to the surface of the skin 1b.

In any event, it is respectfully pointed out that a structure including element 1b of Beaulat, and elements 4 and 3 of Sachse (with element 1b of Beaulat taking the place of element 1 of Sachse) clearly would not correspond to the structure recited in amended independent claim 17, whereby a metal plate provided at the second side of the foundation body panel (the side of the foundation body pane with the plurality of ribs), wherein the foundation body panel is fastened to the metal plate. Indeed, in the structure of element 1b of Beaulat, and elements 4 and 3 of Sachse (with element 1b of Beaulat taking the place of element 1 of Sachse), element 1b of Beaulat would be provided on the "first side" (as defined in claim 17) of the foundation body panel (if element 3 of Sachse were assumed to be a foundation body panel).

Moreover, even if elements 4 and 3 of Sachse were applied to outer skin 1a of Beaulat, the structure recited in amended independent claim 17 still could not be achieved. That is, in such a structure, skins 1a and 1b of Beaulat would be provided on respective sides of element 3 of Sachse (the foundation body panel according to the Examiner), but element 3 of Sachse would not be fixed to element 1b of Beaulat.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that even if Sachse and Beaulat were properly combinable, a logical

combination thereof would not result in the structure recited in amended independent claim 17.

Independent claim 33, moreover, recites: a wall member for a cab of a work vehicle, comprising: (i) an outer metal plate; and (ii) an interior member which is mounted to the outer metal plate, wherein the interior member comprises: a foundation body panel which has a first side and a second side, and which comprises a plurality of ribs at the second side, at least one space being defined by the ribs at the second side of the foundation body panel, wherein the second side of the foundation body panel is mounted on the outer metal plate such that the outer metal plate closes the at least one space defined by the ribs; an outer layer material provided at the first side of the foundation body panel; and a first sound absorbing member comprising a sound absorbing material provided between the outer layer material and the first side of the foundation body panel.

Thus, independent claim 33 recites that the second side of the foundation body panel is mounted on the outer metal plate such that the outer metal plate closes the at least one space defined by the ribs.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that even if Sachse and Beaulat were properly combinable, a logical combination thereof would not result in the structure recited in amended independent claim 33.

Still further, independent claim 37 recites a wall member for a cab of a work vehicle, comprising: (i) an outer metal plate; and (ii) an interior member which is mounted to the outer metal plate, wherein the interior member comprises: an inner metal plate, which is mounted on the outer metal plate with a space provided between the inner metal plate and the outer metal plate; a foundation body panel which has a first side and a second side, and which comprises a plurality of ribs at the second side, at least one space being defined by the ribs at the second side of the foundation body panel, wherein the second side of the foundation body panel is mounted on the inner metal plate such that the inner metal plate closes the at least one space defined by the ribs and such that the inner metal plate is positioned between the foundation body panel and the outer metal plate; an outer layer material provided at the first side of the foundation body panel; and a first sound absorbing member comprising a sound absorbing material provided between the outer layer material and the first side of the foundation body panel.

Thus, independent claim 37 recites that the second side of the foundation body panel is mounted on the inner metal plate such that the inner metal plate closes the at least one space defined by the ribs.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that even if Sachse and Beaulat were properly combinable, a logical

combination thereof would not result in the structure recited in amended independent claim 37.

Independent claim 37 also recites an outer metal plate, and recites that the inner metal plate is positioned between the foundation body panel and the outer metal plate.

As pointed out above, there is no reason to suggest that a logical combination of Sachse with Beaulat would include all three of the metal sheet 1 of Sachse and metal skins 1a and 1b of Beaulat (since, logically, the metal skin 1a or 1b would stand in for metal sheet 1 of Sachse). However, the Examiner appears to rely on such an interpretation in order to reject claim 37.

Accordingly, for this reason also, it is respectfully submitted that even if Sachse and Beaulat were properly combinable, a logical combination thereof would not result in the structure recited in amended independent claim 37.

It is respectfully submitted, moreover, that the other cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest the features recited in amended independent claim 17, and independent claims 33 and 37.

And it is respectfully submitted amended independent claim 17, independent claims 33 and 37, and all of the claims respectively depending therefrom, clearly patentably distinguish over the cited references, taken in any logical combination consistent with the fair teachings thereof, under 35 USC 103.

Entry of this Amendment, allowance of the claims and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas Holtz/

Douglas Holtz  
Reg. No. 33,902

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.  
220 Fifth Avenue - 16<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10001-7708  
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900

DH:iv:rjl